March 24, 1975

 ${\tt SENATOR}$ STONEY: If he will yield and answer that question please.

PRESIDENT: Oh, alright. Senator Duis you want to respond. Senator Duis.

SENATOR DUIS: Yes. Mr. President and Senator Stoney, we have often tried this, but the Attorney General stops it. Constitutionally we cannot combine the two bills. We have done it occasionally and gotten by with it, but don't try it too often cause somebody will catch you. It should not be that the monetary part is in the enabling legislation. It should not be done. It's a ruling of the Attorney General. It's constitution. You may get by with it once but don't try it twice.

SENATOR STONEY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Frank Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I know there are some technical things here that might be involved. I certainly rise to support the intent of Senator Barnett. I would hate for this body to get the reputation that now exists in Washington, D.C. Because this type of game is age old there. They come through with an authorization piece of legislation which says \bar{I} believe in motherhood, or \bar{I} believe in this, or \bar{I} believe in that, and whatever else. They don't have to put one damn dime with it. So they get everybody else to vote for it. Then when it gets to be time to put the money where the mouth is, then they refuse to do so. I say that a piece of legislation that has to be financed. Without that financing it isn't worth anything anyway. So if we want to adopt a program, if we want to instigate a program, if we want to start a process, then let's put the money with it, or let's forget it. 240 is a good example of that. If 240 wasn't a good bill, that should have been determined right there. Not to pass that bill would have been the proper recourse. But to pass that bill and not pass the funding to go with it is a mockery, a travesty, pass the funding to go with it is a moderly, a discoup, and it's unthinkable in terms of the minds of people when they start saying 'well the Legislature's for this, except they don't want to pay the money for it'. That doesn't make sense. The only place it makes sense is in Washington, D.C. It only makes sense to them because they've been doing it so long. So I'm going to support Senator Barnett. I'm going to support every other move that brings consistency between authorization and appropriation. Only then do you get honest in terms of finance. Any other way is a fraud.

PRESIDENT: Senator Simpson.

SENATOR SIMPSON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, here we go again. We've argued this many times, which should come first, the egg or the chicken. We decided, you know, temporarily once that it would be this way, then we reversed ourself and put the enabling legislation ahead. Now we're coming back and we're going to put the money ahead. It really doesn't make any difference until the time we decide most probably to put this into the Constitution to allow that both of these can be voted on in one vote. Until you do that you're not going to get tied down to responsibility. That is what is happening in a bill such as 240 and 240A, no responsibility. There's no way that I'm going to stand here